

LAW OFFICES OF  
**McGINN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP, PLLC**

A PROFESSIONAL LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY  
PATENTS, TRADEMARKS, COPYRIGHTS, AND INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW  
8321 OLD COURTHOUSE ROAD, SUITE 200

VIENNA, VIRGINIA 22182-3817

TELEPHONE: (703) 761-4100

FACSIMILE/DATA: (703) 761-2375; 761-2376

E-MAIL: ADMIN @ MCGINNIPLAW.COM

SENDER'S E-MAIL: JHOWARD@ MCGINNIPLAW.COM

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

NOV 29 2006

SEAN M. MCGINN  
PHILLIP E. MILLER†  
FREDERICK E. COOPERRIDER†  
JAMES E. HOWARD†  
JOHN J. ORESCH  
SCOTT M. TULINO  
DONALD J. LECHER  
PETER F. MCGEET†  
JOHN W. FITZPATRICK†  
DONALD A. DIPAUT†  
†MEMBER OF BAR OTHER THAN VA

November 29, 2006

**VIA FACSIMILE**

To: Examiner Gerald J. O'Connor  
Group Art Unit: 3627  
U.S.P.T.O.

Facsimile No.: (571) 273-8300

From: James E. Howard

Facsimile No.: (703) 761-2375 or 76

Re: Enclosed Amendment After-Final Rejection Under 37 CFR §1.116  
U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/933,119  
Docket No.: 206-020-01

Dear Examiner O'Connor:

Enclosed for filing is an Amendment in response to the Final Office Action mailed on August 29, 2006, which should place the above-referenced case in condition for allowance.

Thank you in advance for your kind consideration on this case.

Very truly yours,



James E. Howard

JEH/geb

Enclosures

Total pages transmitted: 12

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

NOV 29 2006

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of

Makoto et al.

Serial No.: 09/933,119

Group Art Unit: 3627

Filed: August 21, 2006

Examiner: Gerald J. O'Connor

For: SYSTEM FOR PLACING ORDERS USING CUSTOMER-SPECIFIC  
ELECTRONIC CATALOGHonorable Commissioner of Patents  
Box AF  
Alexandria, VA 22313 - 1450AMENDMENT AFTER FINAL REJECTION UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.116

Sir:

In response to the Office Action dated August 29, 2006, please amend the above-identified application as follows:

INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS

Claims 3, 5, and 7-8 are all the claims presently pending in the application. Claims 3 and 7-8 are amended to more clearly define the invention. Claims 3 and 7-8 are independent.